

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/303,424	05/03/1999	JUSSI LEMILAINEN	017.37066X00	8349
20457 75	90 09/05/2003			
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800			EXAMINER	
			DURAN, ARTHUR D	
ARLINGTON,	VA 22209-9889			
ŕ			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
			DATE MAILED: 09/05/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

'						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	09/303,424	LEMILAINEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Arthur Duran	3622				
The MAILING DATE of this communication apprend for Reply	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence addres	s			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	i6(a). In no event, however, may within the statutory minimum of ill apply and will expire SIX (6) No cause the application to become	r a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. IONTHS from the mailing date of this commun ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 A	<u>ugust 2003</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under <i>B</i> Disposition of Claims			erits is			
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		•			
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accept	ted or b)□ objected to b	y the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	- ,	•				
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in repl	•					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.(). § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Burn * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	e			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(e) (to a provisional app	lication).			
a) The translation of the foreign language prov 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 Notice	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152				

Application/Control Number: 09/303,424 Page 2

Art Unit: 3622

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-35 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

2. The Amendment filed on 8/4/03 is sufficient to overcome the Barber reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-3, 5-18, 21-30, 32, 34, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Rai (6,577,643).

Claims 1, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27: Rai discloses charging for pay-per-access to a vendor network. Rai further discloses:

Art Unit: 3622

inputting a user request to a first network which requests that the user be authorized for connection to the packet data network that the web page is on through a second network;

transmitting from the first network to the second network the user request and an authorization of payment to the second network by the first network for the use by the user of the packet data network;

transmitting from the second network to the first network authentication information granting the user authentication to obtain connection through the second network to the packet data network; and

transmitting the authentication information from the first network to the user which informs the user that authentication to obtain connection to the packet data network has been obtained (Fig. 3; col 6, line 64-col 7, line 12; col 8, lines 40-62; col 4, line 60-col 5, line 7; col 26, line 48-57; col 25, lines 42-50).

Rai further discloses that an access to a webpage on a network can be set to be valid during specific times or limited time periods (col 28, lines 9-25; col 26, line 63-col 27, line 5; col 29, lines 57-65; col 30, lines 13-19; col 19, lines 26-31).

Rai further discloses a first network, a second network, and a packet data network (Fig. 3; col 6, line 64-col 7, line 12; col 8, lines 40-62; col 4, line 60-col 5, line 7; col 26, line 48-57; col 25, lines 42-50).

Rai further discloses that the second network debits from a stored value of service units which have been granted to the user a number of consumed service units, which are identified in each request for consumption of at least one service unit until the number of consumed service

Art Unit: 3622

units equals the number of granted service units (col 27, line 44-col 30, line 46; col 6, lines 26-35).

Rai further discloses the user roaming the second network (Fig. 3; col 6, line 64-col 7, line 12; col 8, lines 40-62; col 4, line 60-col 5, line 7; col 26, line 48-57; col 25, lines 42-50).

Claim 2: Rai discloses a method in accordance with claim 1, and further discloses that the user request includes a quantification of connectivity which the user requests to the packet data network (col 27, line 44-col 30, line 46; col 6, lines 26-35).

Claim 13, 14, 15, 16, 17: Rai discloses a method in accordance with claim 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and further discloses that the inputting of the user request to the first network, the transmitting of the user request and an authorization of payment to the second network, and the transmitting of the authentication information from the second network to the first network and to the user are by secure communications (col 2, lines 8-14).

Claim 3, 3, 32: Rai discloses a method in accordance with claim 2, and further discloses that the quantification comprises at least one service unit with each service unit being encoded with a random number (col 30, lined 45-56; col 26, lines 4-10).

Claim 5, 7, 9, 11, 28: Rai discloses a method in accordance with claim 1, 2, 3, 4, and further discloses that the authentication information comprises a shared key which may be used to create secure communications between the user and the packet data network (col 26, lines 4-10; col 30, lined 45-56)

Claim 6, 8, 10, 12, 29: Rai discloses a method in accordance with claim 5, 7, 11 and further discloses that authentication information is a subscriber identification module SIM comprising a number n of service units with each service unit comprising a different random

Art Unit: 3622

access number uniquely identifying each service unit, a signed response SRES and the shared key Kc (col 27, line 44-col 30, line 46; col 26, lines 4-10; col 30, lined 45-56).

Claim 18, 34, 35: Rai discloses a method in accordance with claim 3, and further discloses that after the user is informed that authentication to obtain connection to the packet data network has been obtained, the user transmits to the second network at least one request for consumption of at least one service unit comprising a random number RAND and a signed response SRES; the second network compares the random number RAND and signed response SRES of each request for consumption of at least one service unit received from the user with stored random numbers RAND and signed responses SRES to determine if a match exists; and if a match exists, the second network permits data packets to pass through the second network between the user and the packet network (col 27, line 44-col 30, line 46; col 26, lines 4-10; col 30, lined 45-56; Fig. 3; col 6, line 64-col 7, line 12; col 8, lines 40-62; col 4, line 60-col 5, line 7; col 26, line 48-57; col 25, lines 42-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 4, 19, 20, 31, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rai (6,577,643) in view of Barber (5,930,777).

Art Unit: 3622

Claim 4, 31, 33: Rai discloses a method in accordance with claim 3. Rai further discloses that each service unit is encoded with a random number (col 30, lined 45-56; col 26, lines 4-10). Rai further discloses the utilization of secure networks (col 2, lines 10-14).

Rai does not explicitly disclose that each service unit has a different random number. However, Barber discloses that each service unit is encoded with a different random number (col 30, lined 45-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Barber's utilization of different random numbers to Rai's utilization random numbers. One would have been motivated to do this to ensure a higher level of security.

Claim 19, 20: Rai discloses a method in accordance with claim 19. Rai further discloses a table (col 37, line 60-col 38, line 40) and extensive accounting procedures (col 27, line 44-col 30, line 46). Rai does not explicitly disclose debiting or a hash table.

However, Barber discloses that the second network debits from a stored value of service units which have been granted to the user a number of consumed service units which are identified in each request for consumption of at least one service unit until the number of consumed service units equals the number of granted service units (col 5, lines 50-56; col 9, line 23-30; col 2, lines 62-66).

However, Barber discloses that each unused service unit is stored in the second network in a hash table and each used service unit is stored in the second network in a hash table (col 10, lines 17-67; col 8, lines 45-65).

Art Unit: 3622

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Barber's utilization of debiting and a hash table to Rai's utilization of tables and accounting information. One would have been motivated to do this because a debiting is an obvious way of managing a user account and a hash table is an obvious way of recording user utilization and accounting information.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Examiner notes that while specific references were made to the prior art, it is actually also the prior art in its entirety that is being referred to.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Duran whose telephone number is (703)305-4687. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (703)305-8469. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

James W. MYHAC Phymany txaminon

8/28/03